

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 4, 6 – 8, and 11 - 22 are presently pending. Claims 1-3, 5, 9, and 10 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 6, 7, 12, 13, and 15 – 18 are amended, and claims 4 and 20 are independent claims. Claims 21 - 24 are new.

Scope of Amendment

Claims 6, 7, 12, 13, and 15 – 18 are amended only to overcome the section 112, first paragraph, rejections. No new subject matter is added by these amendments.

Claim Rejections – 112

Claims 5 – 7, 9, 10, 12, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 now pertains to the “hearing aid of claim 4, wherein the anti-feedback system changes to a fast adaptation mode based on the alert signal.” Applicants respectfully submit that this claim limitation is supported by the specification at least by page 2, lines 5 – 6.

Claim 7 now pertains to the “hearing aid of claim 4, wherein α_{omni} gradually changes its value from 0 to 1, or vice versa, when the directional processing block is changing mode.” Applicants respectfully submit that this limitation is supported by the specification at least by page 3, line 17.

Claims 12, 13, 15, and 16 now recite an FIR filter instead of an adaptive filter. Applicants respectfully submit that the limitations of claim 12 and its associated dependent claims are now fully supported at least by page 4, lines 3 – 4, of the specification.

Claim 17 now pertains to “a tone detector that detects howl ... wherein faster adaptation of the FIR filter is used when the tone detector detects howl.” Applicants respectfully submit that these limitations are supported in the specification at least by page 4, line 28 and Fig. 3.

Claim 18 now pertains to a “hearing aid as claimed in claim 17, wherein a hysteresis is used to allow for fast adaptation in a predefined period after the howl has vanished or after a transition in α_{omni} .” Applicants respectfully submit that these limitations are supported in the specification by at least page 4, lines 28 – 30 and page 5, lines 13 – 16.

At least in view of the above Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6, 7, 12, 17, and 18 now meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

Claim 21 is supported at least by page 4, line 1 of the specification. Claim 22 is supported at least by page 3, lines 12 – 15 of the specification. Claim 23 is supported at least by page 4, lines 3 – 4 of the specification. Claim 24 is supported at least by page 4, lines 4 – 17 of the specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 21 - 24 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 20.

Conclusion

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but to merely show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance in the present application.

However, should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' representative, Naphtali Matlis (Reg. No. 61,592) at the telephone number of the undersigned in order to discuss the application and expedite prosecution.

Dated: July 29, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By

D. Richard Anderson

Registration No.: 40,439

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicants